REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 10-18 have been amended as shown on pages 2-5 of the Reply. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested to place the application in better form for appeal as they are directed towards addressing the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 and do not introduce any new claim limitations.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 10-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although applicants' representative believes the claims are directed to statutory subject matter, claims 10-18 have been amended to address this rejection and further prosecution. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendments to claims 10-18.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, 14 and 16-18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-11, 14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen-Levy *et al.* (US 5,423,034) in view of Nelson (US 2004/0122849 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Cohen-Levy *et al.* or Nelson alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicant's claimed invention.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of

> success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck,* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to a computer object access control graphical user interface for setting computer locations where a computer object can be accessed and users who are permitted to access it. In particular, independent claims 1 and 10 recite similar limitations, namely *a computer object access control graphical user interface rendered on a computer display screen for controlling access to a computer object, comprising a name field indicating a name for the computer object and* ***one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object, at least one of the computer spaces is a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object and at least one of the computer spaces corresponding to access to the computer object for the one or more computer users.*** Cohen-Levy *et al.* and Nelson do not teach or suggest such novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention.

Cohen-Levy *et al.* teaches a file directory structure generator and retrieval tool for use in a computer network. At page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the cited document teaches ***one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object.*** However, at the cited portions, the reference teaches 'window display 82' that lists in a scrolling window format users recognized by the network, and 'access display window 84' that lists different access rights for the selected user. The cited reference is silent regarding ***one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object*** as recited in the subject claims. The Examiner concedes that Cohen-Levy *et al.* fails to teach access control fields that control access to computer object from computer spaces where at least one of the computer spaces is a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object.

The Examiner attempts to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Cohen-Levy with Nelson. Nelson teaches a content management system that provides a user access only to documents within the same domain as the user, or in a public domain. At the cited portions, Nelson teaches a new document being assigned a domain ID as an attribute. This domain ID can be specified by the user who creates the document, or by the system

administrator. If no domain ID is specified, the document can be associated with a public domain that is shared by all users of the system. A user has access only to documents that have the same domain ID as the user or are in the public domain. The system processes the database view to limit user's access to items held in the content management database, that are associated with the user domain - each document can have only one domain ID assigned to it. The user cannot select more than one domain that can access the document, so the domain ID does not indicate ***plural selectable*** computer spaces as in applicants' claimed invention. Furthermore, the domain ID does not provide any indication of the computer that the user is employing to attempt access to the document. The domain ID is assigned to the user and not the equipment the user is employing. As a result, the user can access the document from any computer as a long as the user's domain ID matches the domain ID pf the document. Thus, the system taught by Nelson is silent regarding *one or more access control fields rendered together and indicating* ***plural selectable computer spaces for the computer object***, let alone ***at least one of the computer spaces is a computer where one or more users is located during access to the computer object*** as recited in the subject claims.

In view of the above, it is readily apparent that Cohen-Levy *et al.* and Nelson do not teach or suggest all recited features of independent claims 1 and 10 (and claims 2, 5, 7-9, 11, 14 and 16-18 that depend from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen-Levy *et al.* in view of Nelson and Cohen *et al.* (US 6,507,845 B1). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cohen-Levy *et al.*, Nelson and Cohen *et al.* alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

The subject claims respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Cohen-Levy *et al.* and Nelson alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every aspect of the subject invention as recited in these independent claims. Moreover, Cohen *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of the primary references. Cohen, *et al.* teaches a system for managing collaboration amongst a group of users involved in a task. As

conceded in the Office Action dated August 22, 2005, Cohen *et al.* fails to teach or suggest controlling access to the computer object from a computer location. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Cohen-Levy *et al.*, Nelson nor Cohen *et al*, alone or in combination teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 10 (and claims 3, 4, 6, 12, 13 and 15 that depend from). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP688US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731